Attorney Docket No. 052740

REMARKS

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants gratefully acknowledge that claim 11 is allowed. Claim 11 has been amended

to make it consistent and into a better form because claim 11 has a phrase "using stretch tapes" in

its preamble.

Election/Restriction

Applicants gratefully acknowledge that the restriction requirement has been withdrawn as

a result of the reply filed on March 2, 2007. Thus, claims 8-19 have been considered in the

examination.

Objection to IDS

The information disclosure statement filed on July 12, 2005 was objected to because

copies of foreign patent documents were submitted.

Accordingly, supplemental information disclosure statement with the listed documents

and an English translation of the documents or abstract are attached hereto.

Objection to Specification

The specification was objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for

the subject matter claimed in Claims 10 and 19.

- 6 -

Accordingly, claims 10 and 19 has been cancelled. Thus, the objection has become moot.

Rejections under 35 USC §112, First Paragraph

Claims 10 and 19 were rejected under 35 USC §112, first paragraph, as failing to

comply with the written description requirement.

Accordingly, claims 10 and 19 have been cancelled. Thus, the rejection has become

moot.

Rejections under 35 USC §103(a)

Claims 8-10, 12 and 16-19 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being

unpatentable over Berke (U.S. Patent No. 5,976,173) in view of Krantz (U.S. Patent No.

5,336,219).

As mentioned above claims 10 and 19 have been cancelled.

Claims 8, 9, 12 and 16-18 all have been amended to depend from allowed claim 11.

Thus, claims 8, 9, 12 and 16-18 have become in condition for allowance.

Claim 13 was rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Dunshee

(U.S. Patent No.7,066,182) in view of Rangel et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No.

2004/0082897).

- 7 -

Attorney Docket No. 052740

Claim 13 has been amended to depend from allowed claim 11. Thus, claim 13 also is in

condition for allowance.

Claims 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over

Dunshee (U.S. Patent No.7,066,182) in view of Rangel et al. (U.S. Patent Application

Publication No. 2004/0082897) as applied to claim 13 above, and further in view of Dunshee

et al. (U.S. Patent No. D471,984 S).

Claims 14 and 15 directly or indirectly depend from claim 13, which has been amended to

depend from allowed claim 11. Thus, claims 14 and 15 also has become in condition for

allowance.

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, Applicants

submit that that the claims, as herein amended, are in condition for allowance. Applicants

request such action at an early date.

If the Examiner believes that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the

Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney to arrange for an interview to

expedite the disposition of this case.

- 8 -

Amendment under 37 C.F.R §1.116 Application No. 10/541,939 Attorney Docket No. 052740

If this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees that may be due with respect to this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP

Sadao Kinashi

Attorney for Applicants Registration No. 48,075

Telephone: (202) 822-1100

Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

SK/ar

Attachment: Supplemental IDS